

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
DELTA DIVISION

ADAM GROSCH,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:06CV204-P-A

TUNICA COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI;
TUNICA COUNTY DEPUTY SHERIFF
DORNAE MOSBY; AND HWCC-TUNICA, INC.

VERDICT FORM

Federal Claims

1. Do you find that the plaintiff has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Tunica County Deputy Sheriff Dornae Mosby violated the plaintiff's U.S. Constitution Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment right to be free from unreasonable searches and/or seizures?

☒ Yes

☐ No

2. If you answered "yes," please determine the amount of compensatory damages to be awarded for this claim, if any.

\$25,000.⁰⁰

Please continue to question 3.

3. Do you find that the plaintiff has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that HWCC-Tunica, Inc. violated the plaintiff's U.S. Constitution Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment right to be free from unreasonable searches and/or seizures?

☒ Yes

☐ No

4. If you answered "yes," to question number 3, please determine the amount of compensatory damages to be awarded for this claim, if any.

\$100,000.⁰⁰

Claims under Mississippi Law

A.

5. Do you find that the plaintiff has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that HWCC-Tunica, Inc. is liable for false arrest?

☒ Yes ☐ No

6. Do you find that the plaintiff has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that HWCC-Tunica, Inc. is liable for false imprisonment?

☒ Yes ☐ No

7. Do you find that the plaintiff has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that HWCC-Tunica, Inc. is liable for malicious prosecution?

☒ Yes ☐ No

8. Do you find that the plaintiff has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that HWCC-Tunica, Inc. is liable for abuse of process?

☒ Yes ☐ No

9. If you answered "yes" to one or more of questions 5 through 8, please state what damages should be awarded to the plaintiff for the following, if any.

Out of pocket expenses:

\$ 2,778.67 (No more than \$2,778.67)

B.

10. Do you find that the plaintiff has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that HWCC-Tunica, Inc. is liable for conversion?

☒ Yes

☐ No

11. Do you find that the plaintiff has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that HWCC-Tunica, Inc. is liable for trespass to chattels?

☒ Yes

☐ No

12. If you answered "yes," to question 10 or 11 or both, please state what damages should be awarded to the plaintiff for the following, if any.

\$ 925.00 (no more than \$925.00)

Signed:

Nellie C. Johnson
Jury Foreperson

Date:

09-04-08

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
DELTA DIVISION

ADAM GROSCH,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:06CV204-P-A

TUNICA COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI;
TUNICA COUNTY DEPUTY SHERIFF
DORNAE MOSBY; AND HWCC-TUNICA, INC.

SPECIAL VERDICT FORM

In accordance with the instructions the court gave you regarding punitive damages, please complete the questions set forth below as indicated.

1. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that punitive damages should be awarded to the plaintiff for his claims against HWCC-Tunica, Inc. for false imprisonment, false arrest, malicious prosecution, abuse of process, conversion, and trespass to chattels?

☒ Yes ☐ No

2. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that punitive damages should be awarded to the plaintiff for his claim against HWCC-Tunica, Inc. for violating his Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment rights to be free from unreasonable searches and/or seizures?

☒ Yes ☐ No

3. If you answered "yes" to questions 1 or 2, please indicate the amount of punitive damages that you award.

\$600,550.⁰⁰

Nellie C. Johnson
Jury Foreperson

09-04-08
Date